Remarks/Arguments

Claims 1-20 are now pending in this application. In the September 17, 2004 office action, claims 1-6 and 10-20 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103 (a) as being obvious over U.S. Patent No. 6,477,504 to Hamlin et al. (hereinafter "*Hamlin*"), U.S. Patent No. 6,622,175 to Piller (hereinafter "*Piller*"), and U.S. Patent No. 6,763,395 to Austin (hereinafter "*Austin*"). Claims 7-9 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103 (a) as being obvious over *Hamlin, Piller, Austin* and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,609,128 to Underwood (hereinafter "*Underwood*"). For the reasons set forth below, the applicants respectfully request reconsideration and immediate allowance of this application.

Independent Claim 1

Independent claim 1 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103 (a) as being obvious over *Hamlin* in view of *Piller* and *Austin*. The applicants submit that the cited combination fails to teach, suggest, or describe each recitation of independent claim 1. Specifically, the cited combination fails to describe a "database comprising the one or more questions and data identifying a type of input field for each question" as recited by claim 1. The Office Action suggests that *Austin* teaches "data identifying a type of input field." The applicants respectfully disagree. The cited portion of *Austin* describes three parts of a packet of bytes within a message. Nothing within those three parts describes data identifying a type of input field in the context recited by claim 1. Data identifying a type of input field, as recited by claim 1, describes the type of field to be generated for accepting user input for each associated question in the survey. Page 9, lines 22-26 of the present specification states, "For instance, the response type field 44E may indicate that a text field for entering numbers, words, or other small pieces of text, a text area field for free-form, multi-line text entries, a radio button for picking one item in a list, or other type of input field should be displayed." The cited portion of *Austin* does not describe a type of user input field for responding to a question.

Further, the cited combination fails to describe "in response to the request, determining whether a previously compiled class file should be utilized to respond to the request" as recited by claim 1. The Office Action acknowledges that *Hamlin* does not teach the use of class files

and cites *Piller* as doing so. However, neither *Hamlin* nor *Piller*, alone or in combination, teaches or suggests determining whether a previously compiled file, class file or otherwise, should be used in response to a request for a network resource including the electronic survey. Similarly, the cited combination fails to describe "in response to determining that a previously compiled class file should not be utilized to respond to the request, creating an executable class file capable of generating markup language for displaying the questions and the input fields in a web browser" as recited by claim 1. According to the recitations of claim 1, if the determination is made that a previously compiled class file should not be utilized to respond to the request, an executable class file is created that is capable of generating markup language for displaying the questions and input fields in a web browser. The cited art cannot teach or suggest this recitation since the cited art does not teach making any determination as to whether or not to use a previously compiled file. Accordingly, for at least these reasons, independent claim 1 is allowable over *Hamlin* in view of *Piller* and *Austin*.

Dependent Claim 2

Dependent claim 2 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103 (a) as being obvious over *Hamlin* in view of *Piller* and *Austin*. The applicants submit that the cited combination fails to teach, suggest, or describe any recitation of dependent claim 2. As discussed above with respect to independent claim 1, the cited art does not teach determining whether a previously compiled class file should be utilized. Further, there is no teaching within any of the cited references that describes or suggests making a determination as to whether a request for a network resource including an electronic survey is a first request. *Hamlin* teaches a request for a survey, but no determination is made as to whether the request is a first request. Accordingly, for at least these reasons, and because claim 2 depends from allowable independent claim 1, dependent claim 2 is allowable over the cited art.

Dependent Claims 3, 11, and 17

Dependent claims 3, 11, and 17 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103 (a) as being obvious over *Hamlin* in view of *Piller* and *Austin*. The applicants submit that the cited combination fails

-9-

to teach, suggest, or describe any recitation of dependent claims 3, 11, and 17. As discussed above with respect to independent claim 1 and dependent claim 2, the cited art fails to teach or suggest determining whether a previously compiled class file should be utilized and determining whether said request for said network resource was a first request for said network resource. Further, the cited art fails to teach or suggest whether a web server operative to provide said network resource or a software component was reset since the last time said network resource was accessed as recited by claims 3, 11, and 17. Although the Office Action cites *Austin* for teaching this recitation, the applicants respectfully submit that the referenced portion of *Austin* only states that if a tag does not exist, then to create the tag. This is not equivalent to determining whether a network resource or software component was reset since the last access. Accordingly, for at least these reasons, and because claims 3, 11, and 17 depend from allowable independent claims 1, 10, and 15, dependent claims 3, 11, and 17 are allowable over the cited art.

Dependent Claims 6-9, 14, and 18-20

Dependent claims 6, 14, and 18-20 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103 (a) as being obvious over *Hamlin* in view of *Piller* and *Austin*. Claims 7-9 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103 (a) as being obvious over *Hamlin* in view of *Piller*, *Austin*, and *Underwood*. The applicants submit that the cited combination fails to teach, suggest, or describe any recitation of dependent claims 6-9, 14, and 18-20. The cited art does not describe or suggest questions in a database that are not included in a survey if there is an indication that the question should not be included. For example, Fig. 3 of the present application shows fields for "application name," "form name," "version," and "active?." If any of these parameters do not match the survey parameters, then the associated question is not included. Because the cited art does not describe or suggest this feature, and because claims 6-9, 14, and 18-20 depend from allowable independent claims 1, 10, and 15, dependent claims 6-9, 14, and 18-20 are allowable over the cited art.

Independent Claim 10

Independent claim 10 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103 (a) as being obvious over *Hamlin* in view of *Piller* and *Austin*. The applicants submit that the cited combination fails to

teach, suggest, or describe each recitation of independent claim 10. In particular, the cited combination fails to describe "a survey database comprising the one or more questions and data identifying a type of input field for each question," "the software component operative to determine whether a previously compiled class file should be utilized to respond to a request for the network resource," and "to create an executable class file capable of generating markup language for displaying the questions and the input fields in a web browser in response to determining that a previously compiled class file should not be utilized" as recited in claim 10. For at least the same reasons discussed above with respect to independent claim 1, independent claim 10 is allowable over *Hamlin* in view of *Piller* and *Austin*.

Independent Claim 15

Independent claim 15 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103 (a) as being obvious over *Hamlin* in view of *Piller* and *Austin*. The applicants submit that the cited combination fails to teach, suggest, or describe each recitation of independent claim 15. In particular, the cited combination fails to describe a computer-readable medium comprising computer-readable instructions which, when executed by a computer, cause the computer to "in response to determining that a request for the network resource has been received, determining whether a previously compiled class file should be utilized to respond to the request" and "in response to determining that a previously compiled class file should not be utilized, creating an executable class file capable of retrieving one or more questions and corresponding input fields from a survey database" as recited by claim 15. For at least the same reasons discussed above with respect to independent claim 1, independent claim 15 is allowable over *Hamlin* in view of *Piller* and *Austin*.

Dependent Claims 4-5, 12-13, and 16

Because the prior art of record fails to teach, suggest, or describe the recitations of claims 4-5, 12-13, and 16 and because claims 4-5, 12-13, and 16 depend from allowable independent claims 1, 10, and 15, dependent claims 4-5, 12-13, and 16 are allowable over the cited art.

New Claims 21-25

The applicants have added new claims 21-25. Support for claims 21-24 is found on page 10, lines 4-12 of the current specification. Support for claim 25 is found on page 10, line 28 - page 11, line 9 of the current specification. The applicants submit that because the art of record fails to teach, suggest, or describe the recitations of claims 21-25, new claims 21-25 are allowable over the cited art.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing amendment and remarks, the applicants respectfully submit that the present application is in condition for allowance. Reconsideration and reexamination of the application and allowance of the claims at an early date is solicited. If the Examiner has any questions or comments concerning this matter, the Examiner is invited to contact the applicants' undersigned attorney at the number below.

Respectfully submitted,

MERCHANT & GOULD, LLC

Date: December 14, 2004

By: Leonard J. Hope
Reg. No. 44,774

Merchant & Gould
P.O. Box 2903
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55402-0903
Telephone: 404.954.5100

39262
PATENT TRADEMARK OFFICE